

SEP 12 2000 JK

2

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF WASHINGTON WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

3

4

5

6

7

8

1

PERRY MADSEN,

v.

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. C00-1277P

JUDGE PHILLIPS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER DECLINING TO SERVE COMPLAINT AND GRANTING LEAVE TO AMEND

9

10

The Court, having reviewed the complaint and record, does 11 hereby find and ORDER:

12 To sustain a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a 13 plaintiff must assert that (a) the defendant acted under color 14 of state law, and (b) the defendant's conduct deprived the 15 plaintiff of a constitutional right. Balistreri v. Pacifica 16 Police Dept., 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988); Rinker v. Napa 17 County, 831 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1987). In addition, a 18 plaintiff must allege facts showing how individually named 19 defendants caused or personally participated in causing the harm 20 alleged in the complaint. Arnold v. IBM, 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 21 (9th Cir. 1981).

Where a prisoner challenges the fact or duration of his 23 confinement, his sole federal remedy is a writ of habeas corpus, 24 to which the exhaustion requirement applies. Preiser v. 25 Rodriquez, 411 U.S. 475, 489-90 (1973); Young v. Kenny, 907 F.2d

26

22

27 ORDER DECLINING TO SERVE AND GRANTING LEAVE TO AMEND 28 Page - 1

```
1 874, 875 (9th Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 498 U.S. 1126 (1991).
2 In Heck v. Humphrey , 512 U.S. 477 (1994), the United States
3 Supreme Court held that a § 1983 claim that calls into question
4 the lawfulness of a plaintiff's conviction or confinement does
5 not accrue "unless and until the conviction or sentence is
6 reversed, expunged, invalidated, or impugned by the grant of a
7 writ of habeas corpus." Id. at 489.
```

- The Court declines to order that Plaintiff's complaint 9 be served on Defendants until he corrects the deficiencies 10 identified below:
- Plaintiff appears to allege in his civil rights 12 complaint that his constitutional rights were violated by the 13 conduct of King County Superior Court Judge Darrel Philips, King 14 County Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Sharon Hayden and King County 15 Probation Officer Heather Schwall.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held that, in 16 light of common law immunity principles, persons who perform 18 official functions in the judicial process are absolutely immune from liability for damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Briscoe v. LaHue, 460 U.S. 325,334-36 (1983). Prosecutors have 20 21 specifically been accorded absolute immunity from section 1983 22 claims for acts done within the scope of their official duties. 23 Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409 (1976). "If the prosecutor 24 acts as an advocate 'in initiating a prosecution and in 25 presenting the State's case,' absolute immunity is warranted."

27 ORDER DECLINING TO SERVE AND GRANTING LEAVE TO AMEND Page - 2

26

11

```
1 Ybarra v. Reno Thunderbird Mobile Home Village, 723 F.2d 675,
 2 678 (9th Cir. 1984) (quoting <u>Imbler</u>, 424 U.S. at 430-431). In
 3 addition, "probation officers preparing reports for the use of
  state courts possess an absolute judicial immunity from damage
 5 suits under [§] 1983 arising from acts performed within the
 6 scope of their official duties." Demoran v. Witt, 781 F.2d 155,
 7 157 (9th Cir. 1986).
        The allegations made by Plaintiff against Defendant Philips
 8
 9 appear to represent actions taken by this judicial officer in
10 his official capacity. Defendant Philips is therefore
11 absolutely immune from liability for damages in this action.
12 Likewise, the allegations made by Plaintiff against Defendant
13 Hayden appear to represent actions taken in her role as an
14 advocate for King County. Finally, the allegations made by
15 Plaintiff against Defendant Scwall appear to arise from acts she
16 performed within the scope of her official duties for King
17 County. Accordingly, they are immune from liability for damages
18 in this § 1983 action.
             Finally, the allegations set forth in the complaint
19
20 arise out of a criminal investigation of Plaintiff and his
21 subsequent prosecution. It appears likely that a decision on
22 these claims would call into question the validity of
23 Plaintiff's present confinement. In order to proceed on these
24 claims, Plaintiff must demonstrate that his claims against are
25 not barred by Heck.
26
27 ORDER DECLINING TO SERVE
   AND GRANTING LEAVE TO AMEND
```

28 | Page - 3

(3) Plaintiff may file an amended complaint curing the
above-mentioned deficiencies within thirty days of the date on
which this Order is signed. The amended complaint must carry
the same case number as this one. If no amended complaint is
timely filed, or if Plaintiff fails to correct the deficiencies
identified in this Order, the Court will dismiss this action fo
failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

The Clerk is directed to send Plaintiff the appropriate forms so that he may file an amended complaint. Clerk is further directed to send copies of this Order, and of the General Order, to Plaintiff and a copy of this Order to the Honorable Marsha J. Pechman.

United/States Magistrate Judge

DATED this 2 day of September, 2000.

27 ORDER DECLINING TO SERVE AND GRANTING LEAVE TO AMEND 28 Page - 4